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## Slick Pimpin’

### Slick Pimpin’

**Due to ineffective convicting of IPV offenders, the aff only bans guns for the 2% who go to jail and don’t reoffend, 98% are those aren’t officially IPV offenders yet so the aff can’t solve and only makes it worse for those who return as better people. HAMBI 14**

Hambi, Sherry. "Guess How Many Domestic Violence Offenders Go to Jail." Psychology Today. N.p., 2014. Web. 29 Mar. 2016. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-web-violence/201410/guess-how-many-domestic-violence-offenders-go-jail>.

**We identified** 517 **cases of domestic violence** in our nationally representative survey and asked family members whether they reported to the police, and, if they did, how the police **and** criminal justice system handled their cases. What we **found** are **cracks in the system** and lots of them. In the end, you won't believe how few people who commit domestic violence ever spend even a single day in jail. Start: 517 **cases** of domestic violence. Crack #1: **Not reported to the police**. This is the biggest "crack." **Only about 1 in 4 cases of domestic violence are reported to the police.** There are probably a lot of reasons for this, not all of them bad. In some places—Ferguson, Missouri comes to mind—calling the police might create more problems than it solves. In other cases, some other, more informal intervention might happen. It is important to realize that in some cases, victims might not be physically able to call the police, either because of their injuries or because the assault happens in a socially isolated place where they cannot access their telephone. Number of cases left after Crack #1: 130 Crack #2: **The police do not investigate**. This was the most surprising crack and one that "disappears" from many official police records. Even we were shocked to see that out of those 130 reports to the police—already a select and, on average, more serious group of incidents—that in 27 of those cases police never showed up in person to investigate. That is 1 in 5 dismissed on the phone! Domestic violence is a serious problem that should not be getting screened out over the telephone. Number of cases left after Crack #2: 103 Crack #3: Police do not arrest. All 50 states have, in recent years, passed probable cause, mandatory arrest, or other laws to encourage or require police officers to make an arrest in a domestic violence incident. I am actually a fan of police discretion—there are too many situations, probably millions, for any one-size-fits-all approach. However, only 3 in 5 cases that were investigated by police led to an arrest. Perhaps even more surprisingly, this rate was not higher in mandatory arrest states than in other states! Number of cases left after Crack #3: 61 Crack #4: **Criminal charges never filed**. This is one that must be frustrating for police officers. Domestic violence incidents are some of the most dangerous calls that they go out on and they are already applying a lot of discretion in who they choose to arrest. Laws have also changed so that "victimless prosecution" is possible—the district attorney can usually proceed without the testimony of the victim. So imagine law enforcement's frustration that in a large number of cases, the prosecuting attorney's office never files charges. This probably happens more often than people realize—our data are similar to other research in this area. For 18 of these perpetrators, they get out of the system here. **Almost 1 in 3 do not have charges filed.** Number of cases left after this crack: 43 Crack #5: **No conviction or guilty plea**. Now we are truly down to a very select group of perpetrators—less than 10% of the original sample. And yet, probably much to the frustration and chagrin of prosecuting attorneys, less than half are ever convicted or plea guilty in a plea agreement. Number of cases left after this crack: 16 Crack #6: **No jail time** Out of those 16, **still more than a third never spend more than a single day in jail**. Not one day! I know I was personally shocked by these data because I developed a whole series of questions about the length of the jail term, whether they were released early, whether they received probation **after their incarceration**, etc. I would never have devoted that space in our survey if I'd known those questions would be asked about only 10 incidents. Earlier data on domestic violence arrests were similarly grim, but I really believed that the system had changed. It is not often that I feel naïve about the system, but these data made me feel that way. Number of cases left after this crack: 10 **Less than 2% of domestic violence offenders ever received any jail time.** I do not think that all 517 of these perpetrators deserved to spend time in jail. However, I am pretty sure more than 10 did. More than a third of these cases involved some kind of physical injury and 61 involved an injury bad enough to need medical attention. So 61 might be a good minimum starting point for how many of these offenders should have been convicted for assault. The next time you wonder why a victim did not call the police, remember that more than 90% of the time, when the police are called, the offender does not go to jail. **Even in this day and age, calling the police is not a way to get a domestic violence offender out of the house.** That needs to change.

#### In the 1AC pimping out of all womxn’s violence results in an essentialization of womxn identified survivors. The one-size-fits-all policy of the affirmative assumes the privilege of calling 911 which actively maintains systems of white cis hetero privilege while simultaneously destroying any way for womxn of color to gain access to protections—legally or individually. Carlson 14:

From Gun Politics to Self- Defense Politics: A Feminist Critique of the Great Gun Debate Jennifer D. Carlson1 Violence Against Women 2014, Vol. 20(3) 369– 377

Likewise, Floyd (2005), who owns guns and even obtained a concealed pistol license, expresses an ambiguous endorsement of guns that resists a clear normative relationship between women and guns: While in general I wish folks weren’t armed, I will admit that when I hear a story of a woman defending herself with her gun–when she stops her attacker or foils a kidnapping attempt or a rape–I’m glad she had her gun that day. For those whose life is in danger, I understand the need to be armed. (p. 175) Floyd’s acknowledgment that women experience different relationships to violence and guns leads her to resist a one-size-fits-all endorsement of gun control or gun rights. She leaves open the diverse meanings, barriers, and practices embraced and encountered by women who may fall victim to violence, who may choose to purchase firearms, and who decide to participate in self-defense training. This approach opens up a more meaningful discussion of who might most need access to the means of self-protection and who might be systematically barred from those means, despite the wide availability of firearms. Specifically, not all women are equally able to depend on others to protect them— whether police, husbands, or simply the structural securities provided by social privilege (Stange, 2006). White, middle-class women who live in the suburbs will generally have better access to police protection and will be more able to afford a range of security devices ranging from SUVs to home alarm systems. And should such women fall victim to crime, particularly perpetrated by strangers rather than domestic abusers, they will likely be viewed as virtuous victims, eliciting public sympathy (Stabile, 2006). Women who do not inhabit class and racial privilege may be precisely those who most need access to the means of self-defense (whether or not that includes guns); poor women of color, for example, are more likely to be victims of crime and also more likely to suffer from lack of police protection (Miller, 2008). They are also more likely to be treated with suspicion as to whether they are worthy victims (Floyd, 2005). Yet, these inequalities are largely ignored in gun control advocacy (Kelly, 2004). But if gun control advocacy assumes a White, middle-class subject, which women does the gun lobby represent? Today, women are courted by pro-gun outlets ranging from the NRA to Women & Guns, a magazine aimed at gun-toting women, while figures like Paxton Quigley have made a business of training women how to arm themselves for self-defense. Advertisements from the 1980s and 1990s, as Browder (2008) demonstrates, “promoted the notion that good mothers and responsible single women needed to carry handguns to ensure their own safety and the safety of their families” (p. 9). And although the NRA’s interest in women shooters is relatively recent (Floyd, 2005), Floyd’s (2005) She’s Got a Gun and Browder’s (2008) Her Best Shot both show that it is White women who have been historically courted by gun culture. White women were encouraged to carry a gun for self-defense at least as far back as the Civil War, and “firearms manufacturers have always targeted white middle- and upper-class [female] buyers” (Floyd, 2005, p. 142). Gun advertisements were typically “placed in family magazines designed to attract the gentry, despite the fact that white workingclass women, poor women, and women of color experienced greater violence” (Floyd, 2005, p. 142). This dominant framing continues to obscure armed women who do not fit into this narrative of White domesticity; Browder (2008) finds women of color virtually absent from Women & Guns. The silence about women of color perpetuated by both the gun rights lobby and gun control lobby has serious consequences. Consider the case of Marissa Alexander, an African American woman who was sentenced to 20 years in prison in May 2012 for three counts of aggravated assault. Despite the “Stand Your Ground” and “Castle Doctrine” laws that declare that a person has no duty to retreat from any place she has a legal right to be, especially her home, Alexander was unable to plead self-defense as she fired a warning shot toward her husband during a violent confrontation that he allegedly started. An African American woman from Jacksonville, Florida, Alexander stands at the intersection of race and class that makes her an unworthy subject of selfdefense. Women have historically been denied the right to justifiable homicide in the context of their own homes and instead have been treated as criminals (Gillespie, 1989), and armed African Americans have been historically treated with particular suspicion. Alexander’s case calls to mind Carlen’s (2010) observation that even though women are less likely than men to be punished, when they are, their punishment reflects a violation of both the formal control of the law and the informal control of femininity. The case demonstrates that women’s resistance to violence, particularly among women of color, remains culturally unintelligible, even in the relatively “progun” context of Florida. Alexander’s case further demonstrates that the decision to dial 911 versus use a gun already assumes a particular form of privilege in which both of those options are actually viable. Alexander’s case reveals that social reality exceeds both institutional expectations (i.e., the efficacy of dialing 911) and legal rights (i.e., the recognition of one’s right to self-defense). Alexander’s case suggests that feminists committed to interrogating interlocking oppressions should move away from whether or not women can or should defend themselves with a gun and instead ask the question of how, and with what consequences, their right to self-defense is constructed and restricted both culturally and legally. This requires a shift in public debate from the narrow question of gun politics to the broader issue of self-defense politics.

#### The 1AC fails to realize is that one of the most dangerous forms of assault are perpetuated by law enforcement onto queer and trans bodies of color. Not only do you solve for 2% of the population, but you actively obscure discussions that involve the violence inflict upon womxn of color. Put those self-defense answer away because this isn’t *just* a self defense argument. Rather we say more sexual assault happens in the world of the 1ac because LAW ENFORCERS do not get convicted. Arkles 14:

Arkles, Gabriel. "Gun control, mental illness, and black trans and lesbian survival." Mental Illness, and Black Trans and Lesbian Survival (January 3, 2014). Southwestern Law Review 42.4 (2013): 855-899.

Trans people of color and queer women of color cannot rely on police to defend them from any of these forms of violence. In fact, police are often the perpetrators of violence, including sexual violence. 40 For example, a Native American trans woman described: “The police are not here to serve, they are here to get served. . .Every night I am taken into an alley and given the choice between having sex and going to jail.” 41 A trans man reported a security guard and police threatening to rape him: “The security guard said, ‘The trouble is that this fucking lesbian needs to know what it’s like to be with a man.’ They all started to laugh. ‘I could show her,’ one police officer said.” 42 Because they are overwhelmingly targeted for violence and do not receive institutional protection from this violence, trans people of color and queer women of color are likely to genuinely need to defend themselves and their communities from violence. However, while according to law and public perception self-defense is justified, 43 in practice the self-defense justification works more effectively for those accused of crimes against people with less privilege than they have. This dynamic explains why women are punished for fighting back against men who abuse them 44 And why hate crime laws are used against the groups they are purported to benefit. 45 Certain bodies are considered more worthy defense of than others. 46

#### But what is even worse is that when you DO arrest and potential convict abusers, your blanket view is problematic in the context of black trans/queer relationships. Police assume more “masculine” presenting womxn are the perpetuators of violence, even when they are the victim. The 1AC pimps out womxn while imposing cis normative masculinity on gender non-conforming womxn. Pasulka 16:

*Pasulka, Nicole. The Criminal Black Lesbian: Where Does This Damaging Stereotype Come From.* <http://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2016/03/17/456541972/the-criminal-black-lesbian-where-does-this-damaging-stereotype-come-from> 2016

The resulting stereotype became even more entrenched in the 1940s and 1950s when women's prisons became "synonymous with lesbianism" in popular culture and scholarship, writes historian Estelle Freedman in "The Prison Lesbian: Race, Class, and the Construction of the Aggressive Female Homosexual 1915-1965." Though the stereotype of the aggressive lesbian eventually grew to include working-class white women, early studies of racial dynamics in women's prisons assumed that black women were "homosexual aggressors," while white women were seen as "temporary partners." This association still haunts gay or queer black women today, especially those who are "gender non-conforming," meaning they dress and act in ways that are often perceived as masculine, or don't firmly identify as female. It has a real-life impact on the way black queer women are treated in the press and by the criminal justice system. According to the [Equity Project,](http://www.equityproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/hidden_injustice.pdf) a coalition of experts on LGBT youth and juvenile justice, nearly half — 40 percent — of girls in the juvenile justice system are lesbian, bisexual or transgender, and a whopping 85 percent of those girls are also girls of color. And they often end up in the system not for doing anything criminal, but for offenses like running away from home or breaking school rules. Black queer girls who appear more "masculine" and black youth who identify as trans-masculine are often "treated really aggressively by police," says Aisha Canfield, policy researcher and analyst at [Impact Justice](http://impactjustice.org/), a juvenile justice reform organization that contributed to the Equity Project research. In Canfield's research, girls have told her stories of cops "slamming them against squad cars or fences and saying, 'If you want to act like a boy, we'll treat you like a boy.'" When a gender-nonconforming black girl gets into a fight with a gender-conforming black girl, Canfield says, the gender nonconforming girl is often assumed to be responsible for the fight, and more likely to be punished for it. (Of course, this isn't limited to lesbians or more masculine youth who identify as female. Research suggests that overall, black trans girls and boys experience harsher treatment by law enforcement and at school.) This perception continues as queer black women become adults. When the more masculine partner in a lesbian relationship is the victim of domestic violence, police often arrest her under the mistaken yet pervasive assumption that "the bigger, stronger, more masculine presenting partner is the abuser," according to a report by the [Anti-Violence Project](http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/ncavp2013ipvreport_webfinal.pdf).

The 1AC has positioned itself into an economy of gratitude based on its so-called concern for the *thousands* of women harmed by IPV. Not only is this disingenuous, but the aff lacks actual solvency or a brightline for a step in the right direction. Positioning the affirmative as try or die for some pimps out the violence women—especially womxn of color—face.

#### 1) the plan text in and of itself is the perfection of the white savior via institutions. Not only does it tell womxn of color that they cannot protect themselves, but it FORCES them to be dependent on the state which our Arkles and Pusulka evidence indicate is traumatic and deadly. We are not here for your white savior complex. Nopper 03:

#### Nopper 03 (6)The White Anti-Racist Is an Oxymoron: An Open Letter to “White Anti-Racists” By Tamara K.

Additionally, white activism, especially white anti-racism, is predicated on an economy of gratitude. We are supposed to be grateful that a white person is willing to work with non-white people. We are supposed to be grateful that you actually want to work with us and that you give us your resources. **I would like to know why you have those resources and others do not?** And don't assume that just because I have to ask you for resources that it does not hurt me, pain me even. Don't assume that when you come into the space, that doesn't bother me. Don't assume that when you talk first, talk the most, and talk the most often, that this doesn't hurt me. Don't assume that when I see you get the attention and accolades and the book deals and the speaking engagements that this does not hurt me (because you profit off of pain). And don't assume that when I see how grateful non-white people are to you for being there, for being a "good white" person that this doesn't hurt me. And don't assume that when I get chastised by non-white people because I think your presence is unnecessary that it does not hurt me. Because all of these things remind me of how powerless non-white people are (albeit differently) in relation to white people. All of these gestures that you do reminds me of how grateful I am supposed to be towards you because you actually (or supposedly) care about what is happening to me. I am a bit resentful of economies of gratitude. Further, this structure of white supremacy known as white anti-racism also impacts the larger social world because it still makes white people the most valued people. Non-white people are forced to feel dependent and grateful to white people who will actually interact with us. We are made to feel that we are inferior, incapable, that we really do need white people. And the sad thing is, that given all of the resources that whiteness has and that white people get and control, there is an element of material truth in all of this, I am afraid. But white people need to think of howtheir activism reproduces the actual structure of white supremacy some--not all whites activists--profess to be about.This structure of white supremacy is not just in an activist space, it actually touches upon and impinges on the lives of non-white people who may not be activists (in your sense) or who do not interact with you in activist worlds.

## Case

### Presumption

#### The status quo results in the aff. Obama’s executive action is EXACTLY what the aff does. Federal law already prohibits abusers from acquiring guns but there are loopholes. The executive action solves those loopholes; means there’s no unique solvency for the aff.

#### JELTSEN 1/6

Huffington Post, 1-6-2016, "What Obama's New Move On Guns Does For Domestic Violence Survivors," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/obama-gun-control-domestic-violence\_568d5ff7e4b0c8beacf54c1c Melissa Jeltsen

Obama’s executive action on guns, while modest, includes a number of proposals that advocates and gun violence prevention experts say could help protect domestic violence survivors from armed abusers. That’s important, as research has found that the presence of a gun makes it five times more likely that a woman will be murdered by her abuser. A proposal to expand the definition of who is engaged in the business of selling guns -- and therefore must be licensed and conduct background checks -- could reduce domestic-related gun violence, said Allison Anderman, staff attorney at the Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. "It means that more people will have to get a dealer license," she said. "Those people are more likely now to catch domestic abusers who try to buy guns, and it will limit the number of domestic abusers who will be able to buy guns without a background check." Under Obama’s plan, Anderman added, local authorities will be notified when prohibited individuals try to buy a gun. "Hopefully, what this will do is enable law enforcement to catch domestic abusers who knowingly lie on the federal form they are required to fill out in order to buy a gun," she said. Federal law already prohibits individuals convicted of domestic violence misdemeanors or subject to a permanent protective order from owning or buying guns, but the system has some serious gaps. Currently, prohibited abusers can skirt restrictions by purchasing guns from private sellers at gun shows or online, where they aren’t required to undergo a background check. Ron LeGrand, vice president of public policy at the National Network to End Domestic Violence, said another **key proposal involves incentivizing states to provide complete records about domestic violence crimes to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, so that abusers who aren’t allowed to buy guns are flagged. "We need to know who is out there, and if they are convicted of a domestic violence act.** If we don’t know that, the background check is not as effective and efficient as it needs to be," LeGrand said. "It is not going to save everybody, but it is a step in the right direction." Thirty-eight percent fewer women are shot to death by intimate partners in states where background checks are required for all handgun sales, he added.

This means a.) there is not a reason to vote aff because you don’t do anything so presume neg b.) even if they say they fix loopholes our evidence literally says the executive order also fix loopholes and gives a warrant for which loophole it would fix which is more specific then their aff and c.) if they say exec order wont pass through congress they have to present evidence that there is bipartisanship support for their plan if there isn’t any then exec order solves their aff, vote neg on presumption or if we win our disad then the squo solves

### Criminalization

#### When we identify a problem, we will use the justification for this obvious bad thing and try to find remedies for it. The problem with the affirmative is that they have simply overlooked the cultural ways in which black men are seen, black men are perceived, and black men have to deal with life. The affirmatives framing of IPV ignores the cultural perception of what it means to ban guns for IPV incidents, the aff allows IPV to be associated purely with black males who simply beat their wives and don’t know better.

David J. **Leonard** Antiblack Racism and Moral Panics A National Pastime: Antiblack Racism and Moral Panics September 20, 20**14** Professor and Chair  
Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley David J. Leonard is professor in the Department of Critical Culture, Gender, and Race Studies at Washington State University, Pullman. With a B.A. in black studies from the University of California, Santa Barbara, and a master’s and Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley, he has dedicated his career to interdisciplinary scholarship, transformative teaching, and research that underscores the continued significance of race within popular culture, the structures of politics, and society at large

http://www.theblackscholar.org/a-national-pastime-antiblack-racism-and-moral-panics/

Directed at Rice (and several other players), and Roger Goodell for failing to properly control, discipline, and punish the NFL’s “out-of-control,” **the moral panic feels less and less about intimate partner violence (IPV),** hyper masculinity, **a culture of violence, misogyny, or patriarchy**, **but instead yet another moment to locate social ills within the bodies of black men**. Blackness, especially in the sporting world, is “legible” (Neal 2014) only as signifiers of dysfunctional, danger, criminality, and corruption. **This has been the case with IPV,** and equally evident in the aftermath of Adrian Peterson’s arrest. According to [Jamelle Bouie](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2014/09/blacks_and_corporal_punishment_why_we_invent_black_pathologies.html), “**It’s reminiscent of other conversations around broad-based behaviors or beliefs that become pathological and purely “black” when displayed by black Americans in elevated numbers.” As black bodies are** ubiquitously **imagined as essentially disruptive**, uncontrollable, as a source of “cultural degeneracy” **the problem of IPV becomes not an American problem** and not even one belonging to the NFL — **but a problem of blackness**. **Blackness exists as “a problematic sign and ontological position**” (Williams 1998, p. 140). **The outrage resulting from Ray Rice reflects the logics of anti-black racism, perpetuating a culture that sees blackness as the problem, one that needs to be contained, purified, controlled, punished, and ultimately eliminated**. **The outrage has little to do with the pervasive and endemic problem of IPV** [within the NFL](http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/the-rate-of-domestic-violence-arrests-among-nfl-players/) and society as a whole**. In a nation where 1 in 3 women report having experienced IPV, where 1 in 5 men admit to having committed violence against a partner, one has to wonder why now, why did Ray Rice prompt a national soul searching regarding the problem of IPV?** **In a nation, where the media and the court system routinely rationalize the prevalence of IPV through victim blaming and excuse making,** forgive me if **I ain’t buying this feigned outrage**.

#### The Leonard evidence indicates that any IPV legislation will be centered on criminalizing and affirming the pathology of the black male rapist. Just like in 1994, when we had a drug problem we over criminalized black folk because we associated them inherently with drugs. As soon as we pass the aff, we will center black males as the ones who need to be locked up, because we cant’ have the black male rapist out there in the real world.

Gourevitch June 30th, 2015 ALEX. "Gun Control’s Racist Reality: The Liberal Argument against Giving Police More Power." Saloncom RSS. Salon, 24 June 2015. Web. <http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun\_controls\_racist\_reality\_the\_liberal\_argument\_against\_giving\_police\_more\_power/>.

The dead are buried, the murderer apprehended, and the shock has started to wear off. Now comes the public reaction to the massacre in Charleston.¶ Soon after the shootings at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, the first black president of the United States offered some thoughts on Dylan Roof’s racist attack. First and foremost, President Obama said, recent events were about how “innocent people were killed in part because someone who wanted to inflict harm had no trouble getting their hand on a gun.” The killings were also about a “dark chapter in our history,” namely racial slavery and Jim Crow. Obama only suggested practical action regarding the first issue, namely gun control.¶ He did not consider that such measures will make the persistence of the second problem even worse.¶ It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice.¶ As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority.¶ While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence.¶ This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece¶ “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.”¶ In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following:¶ “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.”¶ This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations.¶.

### Framework

#### Concede material- you make things worse, and the DA shows you make women trust these intuitions even if they don’t have the privilege so we link turn your rob—your focus on materiality ignores their unique materiality and perpetuates white savior messianism

#### Squo meets FW and solves

### Black Males

#### And, TURN. The affirmative’s use of domestic violence ignores the sexual violence black males face. This is not a link of omission, this is the affirmative’s scholarship of domestic violence being centered on women that discursively legitimizes the sexual violence against the black male.

Tommy J. **Curry** The Eschatological Dilemma: The Problem of Studying the Black Male only as the Deaths that Result from Anti-Black Racism. 20**14**

**The sexual violence of Black men and boys has remained a routine aspect of racial violence.** In our everyday lives**, Black men are publically assaulted sexually and exposed to the sexual coercion of the police state, but their stories and these public displays of racism’s sexual component is an unapproachable study under our current disciplinary arrangement of knowledge**, specifically the gender category itself. On January 7th, 2014 Darrin Manning, a 16 year old Black boy, was castrated by a female police officer that found him suspicious. Mr. Manning was a child, a straight “A” student, he was searched, patted down, and then his testicles were squeezed by this woman of the state so hard that they ruptured as indicated by an audible popping.[[1]](#endnote-1) This is not as uncommon as one might think. **Young Black males are constantly subjected to sexual assault and coercion by their daily encounters with the state, in the seclusion created on the street through police interrogations, and** under the aegis of the now unconstitutional surveillance practices known as **“Stop and Frisk.”** [[2]](#endnote-2) On August 9th, 1997, Abner Louima, a Haitian man, was sexually assaulted by officer Justin Volpe in a Brooklyn police station. Louima was arrested for allegedly striking Volpe in a crowd. Once transported to the police station, Louima was forced into a bathroom, where Volpe grabbed his testicles, kicked him in the groin, and then anally penetrated him with a bathroom plunger. Showing no remorse, or rather the sexual etiquette of the police state towards Black men, he paraded the plunger around the station as proof of his conquest. [[3]](#endnote-3) On August 28, 2004, Coprez Coffie was stopped by officers Scott Korhonen and Gerald Lodwich. In an effort to find drugs, officer Korhonen stuck a screwdriver in Coffie’s anus. [[4]](#endnote-4) **Even when white officers assault other non-white peoples, there is an association with the sexual violence committed by the police with Black men.** Angel Perez was raped into submitting to be an informant. In October of 2012, the Chicago police sodomized him with a pistol, with one officer yelling, “I hear that a big [B]lack nigger dick feels like a gun up your ass.”[[5]](#endnote-5) The sexual violence of the police is not isolated to the act of sodomy. **The fear that white men have had of the Black rapist, the mythical beast conjured within the white imagination to justify lynching, also serves as a justification for violence against Black men.** On September 16th, 2013 the white state replied to a 911 call of a white woman fearful of a Black man asking for help at her door step after surviving a car accident. Her fear of this Black man named Jonathon Ferrell led to his murder by the white men of the state.[[6]](#endnote-6)
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